DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 388 131 HE 028 671

TITLE	A Report to the Joint Chairs of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and the House Appropriations Committee on the Workload of the UMS Faculty.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park.
PUB DATE	1 Dec 94
NOTE	63p.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Budgeting; *College Faculty; College Instruction; Faculty Publishing; *Faculty Workload; Higher Education; National Norms; *Productivity; State Government; *State Universities; *Teaching Load
IDENTIFIERS	Faculty Productivity Reports; Faculty Research; Faculty Service; *University of Maryland System

ABSTRACT

This report provides data and recommendations on the workload and productivity of University of Maryland System (UMS) faculty. It outlines the state budgetary policy that mandates the report and explains UMS policy on faculty workload. The data in the report reflect teaching standards in place in 1993-94, prior to the adoption of the current UMS workload policy. Institutional and composite data provide information on: (1) the number of faculty who taught the standard load; (2) the number granted exceptions from the standard load; (3) the number of course-equivalent units taught; and (4) faculty research, publications, presentations, and service. The report found that, of the 3,759 full-time faculty at UMS institutions, 1,137 were granted exceptions from teaching the standard load. More than half of these exceptions were for departmental administration, externally funded research, and for instruction-related reasons. The overall data indicate that UMS teaching productivity is comparable to those at similar institutions nationwide. Three appendixes provide a copy of the UMS policy on faculty workload and responsibilities, a timeline on the development of the policy, and a copy of the survey form and instructions. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 388 131

A REPORT TO THE JOINT CHAIRS OF THE SENATE BUDGET AND TAXATION COMMITTEE AND THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

ON

THE WORKLOAD OF THE UMS FACULTY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara C. Johnson

University of Maryland System Administration

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 027 671

University of Maryland System Administration
December 1, 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. INTRODUCTION

As a family of institutions, the University of Maryland System is committed to ensuring the quality, accountability, and efficiency of its operations. Toward these ends, the UMS Regents adopted a policy on faculty productivity and a reporting format to monitor its implementation. The UMS is pleased to submit the first of the required annual reports and a description of its key features.

Faculty productivity is a complex issue currently debated in the halls of academe and in state legislatures across the country. An effective workload policy must strike a critical balance between providing meaningful measures of workload (for purposes of both internal management and external accountability) and recognizing the vast differences among institutions, departments, and individual faculty members. Moreover, an ideal policy should encourage faculty initiative and creativity and enhance the quality of their teaching, research, and service.

In developing a policy and reporting mechanism, the UMS reviewed similar efforts in many other states. While our policy may not be ideal, we believe that we have developed the best approach presently available. In this regard, we expect to "become a model for American higher education," as stated in our vision statement.

II. MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S REQUEST

The Joint Chairmen's Report included in the FY 1995 budget passed by the Maryland General Assembly states:

> *"SECTION XX. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED. That the following amounts, representing the growth in revenue from tuition and fee increases, may not be expended until the budget committees receive a policy and report on faculty workload. The policy shall establish standards for teaching loads and provide for specific exceptions to those standards. The report shall indicate the number of faculty meeting the standard and the number given specific exceptions, by type of exception (i.e., research grant, administrative responsibilities, public service, etc.). All faculty, not only tenure and tenure-track, shall be included in the report. Each institution shall submit a report by academic department. Once the report, due December 1, is received, the committees shall have 45 days for review.*

Baltimore City Campus	*2,698,469*
College Park Campus	*9,808,713*
Bowie State University	*1,262,047*
Towson State University	*2,412,655*
Eastern Shore Campus	*129,733*
Frostburg State University	*604,047*
Coppin State College	*36,284*

University of Baltimore	*683,694*
Salisbury State University	*614,126*
Baltimore County Campus	*1,598,275*
St. Mary's College of Maryland	*1,151,001*
Morgan State University	*465,745*

Explanation: The committees appreciate the efforts undertaken to quantify and report on faculty workload. However, the committees do not believe that what has been reported to-date provides them with assurances that the institutions are carefully examining what faculty do or evidence that reductions in teaching loads are balanced by equally important responsibilities for scholarship, public service, or administration. The committees request that the University of Maryland System, St. Mary's College and Morgan State University work with the Maryland Higher Education Commission to develop policies and reporting mechanisms in these areas."

III. UMS POLICY ON FACULTY WORKLOAD

On August 19, 1994 the University of Maryland System Board of Regents approved the "Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities." Designed to respond to the Joint Chairmen's language, the policy established standards for teaching loads, provided for specific exceptions to those standards, and provided for accountability. A copy of the policy is included as Attachment A.

Development of the Policy. The UMS policy was developed over a period of three months in consultation with a specially constituted advisory committee of academic vice presidents and representatives of the Council of University System Faculty. Attachment B is a time line of the process followed in the development and adoption of the UMS faculty workload policy. There were extensive consultations with the Maryland Higher Education Commission's staff. Comments from legislative staff were also solicited. The Office of the Attorney General reviewed the policy prior to its adoption by the Regents. On June 14, the legislative budget committees were briefed on the proposed policy at public hearings held in Annapolis. At the hearings, the Secretary for Higher Education testified that the proposed UMS policy was responsive to the language of the FY 1995 budget bill.

Purposes of the Policy. The policy has two purposes:

- To promote optimal performance by UMS faculty; and
- To ensure accountability for that performance.

Centrality of Teaching. The policy reflects the centrality of instruction:

- It mandates that all faculty members, including those with administrative responsibilities at the departmental level, be involved in the instructional program, and
- It mandates that senior faculty in departments with undergraduate programs participate in undergraduate teaching.

At the same time, the policy acknowledges the significant roles of research, scholarship, and service.

Whom Does the Policy Cover? ALL faculty members are covered, with the following exceptions:

- Individuals with faculty rank assigned administrative duties outside the department (deans, vice presidents, presidents), and
- Research associates whose salaries are fully supported by non-state funds.

Specific Guidelines. The following teaching[1] guidelines are included in the policy:

- Faculty at the UMS comprehensive institutions (Bowie, Coppin, Frostburg, Salisbury, Towson, University of Baltimore, and UMES) should teach 7-8 course units each academic year. They are expected to devote 65-75% of their time to instruction, 15-25% to research and scholarship, and 5-15% to service;
- Faculty at the UMS research institutions (UMAB, UMBC, and UMCP) should teach 5-6 course units each academic year. They are expected to devote 45-55% of their time to instruction, 35-45% to research and scholarship, and 5-15% to public service; and
- Faculty at CEES and UMBI are expected to devote 5-15% of their time to instruction, 75-85% to research, and 15-25% to service.

These guidelines are fully consistent with the American Association of University Professors' standards for maximum teaching loads.[2] The professional schools

---

[1] Instruction includes, in addition to classroom time, student advising and all activities necessary to the preparation, delivery, and evaluation of instruction and learning.

[2] "Statement on Faculty Workload," Policy Documents and Reports, AAUP, Washington, D.C., 1990, 163-166.

(medicine, dentistry, pharmacy and law), given their heavy emphasis on clinical instruction, are not covered by these guidelines, but are required to establish their own workload policies, subject to approval of the Chancellor.

Exceptions. The policy allows for limited exceptions to these workload expectations; institutions are to make only those exceptions absolutely necessary to fulfill institutional missions. The policy allows for exceptions due to:

- Additional demands resulting from class size, development of new courses, special methods of instruction, level of instruction, discipline, and accreditation requirements;
- Responsibilities as department chair, assistant chair, or program director; and
- Assignment of additional time for research or such service activities as working with public schools, or with business and industry.

Accountability. Key to the policy are its accountability provisions. Accountability for institutional adherence to the policy rests with the presidents. They are charged with establishing, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, institutional faculty workload policies compatible with the system policy and with their own institutional missions. The main features of the accountability provisions are:

- All faculty will be given workload expectations in accordance with departmental, institutional, and system policies;
- Faculty members will be reviewed annually throughout their employment based on institutional procedures;
- As part of that review, actual performance will be compared with workload expectations;
- Faculty reviews and subsequent actions will reflect fully the results of these comparisons and will be taken into account in the institution's faculty reward structure; consequences for failure to fulfill expectations will be established.

The policy also requires each president to submit annual faculty accountability reports to the Chancellor for delivery to the Board of Regents and to the State.

Implementation. The expectations included in the system policy will be fully implemented in the academic year 1995-1996, (class schedules and instructional assignments for 1994-1995 had been set by the time the Regents approved the

policy).

IV. KEY FEATURES OF THE UMS FACULTY WORKLOAD REPORT

The UMS implemented a process to collect data required by the Joint Chairmen's Report. In developing the data reporting format, MHEC and legislative staffs were consulted, and their suggestions and comments were incorporated. The data format was also presented to the joint committees at the June 14 hearings in Annapolis, and was generally acknowledged as being responsive to the requirements of the FY 1995 budget bill. Attachment C is a copy of the format and the accompanying detailed instructions. As in the policy, a "course unit" was defined as equivalent to a three-credit course. Graded instructional experiences that do not follow the traditional course format (e.g., individual studies, supervision of dissertation research, supervision of student teaching, etc.) were converted to course units using the set of weights incorporated in the policy. The following are the main features of the data format:

- It includes data on ALL faculty, as specified in the budget language;
- It conforms to the 1993-1994 standard load for each department, and it includes the basis for this standard;
- It provides the number of faculty who taught the standard load in place in the 1993-1994 academic year (which is not necessarily the expected load called for in the Regents' policy) and the number granted exceptions to that standard, by type of exception, as specified in the budget language;
- It provides the number of course-equivalent units taught by the faculty;
- It provides the number of courses faculty were excepted from teaching, by type of exception; this information was added at the request of the MHEC;
- It provides for faculty productivity in areas other than instruction, i.e., scholarship, research and service; and
- It provides data by department, as specified in the budget language.

Limitations. There are several limitations inherent in the reporting format and in the data:

- THE DATA IN THE REPORT REFLECT TEACHING STANDARDS IN PLACE IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1993-1994, PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY, SINCE IT WAS ADOPTED IN AUGUST OF 1994. THE REPORT THUS PROVIDES BASELINE DATA FROM WHICH FUTURE INCREASES IN PRODUCTIVITY MAY BE MEASURED OVER TIME;

- The format did not include a question on "full-time equivalent faculty," but rather on the number of persons. This approach was necessitated by the need to identify "exceptions" to the expected load; this means that it would be erroneous to multiply the number of courses expected to be taught by the headcount faculty to obtain the total number of courses that could have been taught. This report provides an alternative and valid methodology;

- The format did not include a question on the number of faculty who taught MORE courses than the standard load;

- Since this format was not appropriate for the professional schools (medicine, law, dentistry, pharmacy), with their heavy emphasis on clinical instruction, they provided data in a different format;

- Most UMS institutions classify their department chairs as faculty for federal reporting purposes (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System - IPEDS) and give them release time from teaching; hence these individuals appear as "exceptions" in this report. UMCP, and to a large extent UMBC, on the other hand, classify department chairs as administrators for IPEDS; thus, they are not included in the "exceptions" category.

The data by department, as requested by the budget language, are appended to this report as Attachment D.

V. HIGHLIGHTS OF THE DATA REPORTED BY THE DEPARTMENTS

Tables 1 through 4 provide a summary of the data provided by the institutions. These tables do not include data for part-time faculty nor from teaching assistants, since they do not have a "standard" load.

Overall Summary. Table 1 is an overall summary of the number of faculty who were given exceptions to teaching the standard load, and the number of exceptions to the standard teaching load.

- 19,382 course units were taught by the tenured, tenure-track, and other full-time faculty in the UMS degree-granting institutions; seventy-seven additional course units were taught by CEES and UMBI's faculty;

- The tenured, tenure-track, and other full-time faculty at the degree-granting institutions were released from teaching 2,844 course units, or 13% of all course units that they could have taught; and

- Of the 3,759 tenured, tenure-track and other full-time faculty at the UMS degree granting institutions, 1,137 were granted exceptions from teaching the standard load; more than half (56%) of these exceptions were for departmental administration, for externally funded research, and for instruction-related reasons (class size, development of new courses, distance education, level of instruction, etc.);

Analysis of Course Exceptions by Type. Table 2 is an analysis of the number of exceptions to the expected teaching load by type:

- 23% of the courseload exceptions (NOT of the number of faculty) were for faculty members on sabbatical; as shown in Table 3, the *number* of faculty on either one semester or one year sabbatical was 201, about 6% of all tenured and tenure-track faculty and departmental administrators;

- Departmental administration accounted for 21% of the courseload exceptions, mostly in those UMS institutions (generally, the comprehensive institutions) which classify department chairs as "faculty with release time;"

- Externally funded research accounted for 18% of the courseload exceptions; most of these exceptions were found in the UMS research institutions;

- Instruction-related demands accounted for 11%, "other" for 12%, and service for 9% of the courseload exceptions. Almost half of the faculty with courseload exceptions due to "other" were on sick/maternity leave, or died during the school year; 28% of the "other" were misclassifications (e.g., faculty on leave without pay who should not have been included, faculty assigned to administrative duties outside the department, etc.).

Non-Instructional Productivity. Table 4 is a summary of the UMS faculty non-instructional (mostly scholarly) productivity. The reporting time frame for these data (1992-1993) is different from the time frame for the instructional data (1993-1994). However, the data provide a more complete picture of the productivity of the UMS faculty:

- $269 million was obtained by the UMS institutions in externally funded research and training grants awarded to faculty members (this figure does not include institutional grants such as Title III);
- The UMS faculty published more than 800 books, close to 9,000 peer reviewed articles, and made more than 10,000 professional presentations; and
- The UMS faculty spent more than 60,000 days in service to business, government, schools, their institutions, and their profession - about 15 days a year per tenured and tenure track faculty member.

Departmental Summary. A set of institutional tables summarizes the departmental data. For each department, the following data are included: the standard teaching load of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and the total number of course exceptions, the number of faculty who taught the standard load or more, the number of faculty granted course exceptions, and selected indicators of non-instructional productivity, e.g., books published, grants and contracts. The departments are grouped by general discipline area (humanities, sciences, education, etc.).

- At the comprehensive institutions, the standard teaching load in the 1993-1994 academic year was 8 courses across most departments (with such exceptions due to accreditation standards);
- There were more departmental variations in standard teaching load at the research institutions - national practices in similar departments in other research universities being the major determinant of workload. Generally, departments with lower teaching loads reported larger amounts of funds received in grants and contracts. These departments tend to be concentrated in the sciences.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The UMS has complied with the Fiscal Year 1995 budget language: the Regents have adopted a faculty workload policy which is responsive to the legislative concerns, and the data requested in the Joint Chairmen's Report is being provided to MHEC and the legislative staffs.

The data reported by the institutions suggest some further refinements to the reporting format, which will help ensure better accountability for the performance of the faculty:

- The format should include the number of "full-time equivalent faculty" as a global measure of resources available to the department;
- The format should include the number of faculty who taught more than the standard load;
- Institutions should review the status of individuals who appear to be improperly classified as faculty.

In previous reports to the General Assembly, the UMS has shown that its faculty's teaching productivity is comparable to national practices. This report points up areas that require further consideration. To achieve the Regents' policy's objective of promoting optimal performance by UMS faculty:

- Additional responsibility is being placed on the department chairs to assure that departmental teaching, research, and service responsibilities are met. Professional development workshops for department chairs (successfully introduced at the request of CUSF this Fall), should be continued;
- Departmental exceptions to the expected teaching load included in the institution's policy should be kept to a minimum and fully justified;
- The Chancellor will review the departmental exceptions to the institution's policy and their rationale, and will report his findings to the Regents;
- The Chancellor will review annually the number of courseload exceptions, as well as the number of faculty granted exceptions, and will report his findings to the Regents;
- The number of course units taught, particularly those related to the availability of required undergraduate courses will be reviewed.
- It is intended that these data and those from subsequent reports will provide the basis for the UMS President, in consultation with the Chancellor, to make any necessary adjustments to the number of exceptions to expected teaching loads.

This report represents only a first step. The information collected for academic year 1993-1994 will provide baseline data against which we can measure the effects of the implementation of the Regents' policy. The UMS policy, when fully implemented in 1995-1996, should result in an increase in the instructional productivity of the faculty. Equally important, it will serve as the mechanism to assure the Governor, the General Assembly, and the public that the UMS is truly accountable in the area of faculty workload.

Table 1
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
Faculty Instructional Workload
Fall 1993 - Spring 1994

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty*

	Analysis by Courses				Analysis by Faculty				
Institution	Total N of Course Units Taught	Total # of Course Exceptions	Possible Courses (Taught + Exceptions)	Exceptions as % of Possible N of Courses**	# of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load or More	# and % of Faculty With Course Exceptions (All Types) #	%	# and % of Faculty With Instruct, Research & Dep. Admin. Exceptions*** #	%
Bowie St. Un.	756	98	854	11%	142	26	15%	19	73%
Coppin St. Coll.	1,247	95	1,342	7%	77	33	30%	22	67%
Frostburg St. Un.	1,683	216	1,869	11%	144	92	39%	69	75%
Salisbury St. Un.	1,651	265	1,916	14%	150	87	37%	60	69%
Towson St. Un.	3,149	589	3,738	16%	301	176	37%	98	56%
Un. of Balt.****	658	91	749	12%	86	39	31%	25	64%
UMAB****	530	169	699	24%	108	64	37%	25	39%
UMBC	1,899	174	2,073	8%	305	96	24%	49	51%
UMCP	6,693	924	7,617	12%	1,229	459	27%	218.5	48%
UMES	1,039	223	1,261	18%	80	65	45%	51	78%
Degree-Granting Inst.	19,305	2,844	22,148	13%	2,622	1,137	30%	637	56%
CEES	44								
UMBI	33								
UMS	19,382								

* Tenured and tenure-track faculty, other full-time instructional and research faculty, and departmental administrators.
** N of Exceptions/(Course Units Taught + N of Exemptions)
*** Excludes faculty with course exceptions due to department supported research, service, sabbatical and other.
****Excluding professional schools: law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy,

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

UMSA OAA Nov 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM

Faculty Instructional Workload

Fall 1993 - Spring 1994

Analysis of Course Exceptions by Type

Institution		# of Course Unit Exceptions to Expected Teaching Load by Type									Total # of Course Except.
		Instruction	Department. Administrat.**	External Research	Department. Research	Service: Profession	Service: Internal	Service: Public	Sabbatical*	Other	
Bowie St. Un.	#	10	48	8	0	0	0	0	8	18	92
		11%	52%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	20%	100%
Coppin St. Coll.	#	6	28	16	1	0	11	0	11	22	95
		6%	30%	17%	1%	0%	12%	0%	12%	24%	102%
Frostburg St. Un.	#	44	89	3	4	4	6	4	56	7	216
		16%	33%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	20%	3%	80%
Salisbury St. Un.	#	15	80	17	0	2	13	1	92	44	265
		6%	30%	6%	0%	1%	5%	0%	34%	16%	98%
Towson St. Un.	#	44	186	54	14	26	31	3	139	92	589
		8%	32%	9%	2%	4%	5%	1%	24%	16%	101%
Un. of Balt.****	#	0	35	17	0	5	8	0	10	16	91
		0%	41%	20%	0%	6%	9%	0%	12%	19%	107%
UMAB****	#	16	39	52	2	8	0	1	21	30	169
		9%	23%	31%	1%	5%	0%	1%	12%	18%	100%
UMBC	#	15	11	47	15	3	8	1	67	7	174
		9%	6%	27%	9%	2%	5%	1%	39%	4%	100%
UMCP	#	152	72	197	130	30	46	13	234	50	924
		16%	8%	21%	14%	3%	5%	1%	25%	5%	100%
UMES	#	22	16	86	0	8	5	16	8	61	223
		10%	7%	39%	0%	4%	2%	7%	4%	27%	100%
UMS	#	325	607	499	166	86	128	39	648	348	2,846
		11.4%	21.3%	17.5%	5.8%	3.0%	4.5%	1.4%	22.8%	12.2%	100.0%

* These are NOT the number of faculty on sabbatical, rather the number of courses the faculty on sabbatical did not teach. See Table 3 for the number of faculty on sabbatical.

UMSA:OAA: Nov 1994

** Most UMS institutions classify their department chairs as faculty for IPEDS and give them release time from teaching; hence these individuals appear as "exceptions (administrative)" in the workload report. UMCP, and to a large extent UMBC, on the other hand, classify department chairs as administrat for IPEDS. Thus, they are not included in the "exceptions" category.

***Excluding professional schools: law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy,

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

Table 3
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
Number of Faculty on Sabbatical

Fall 1993 - Spring 1994

	# of Faculty On Sabbatical*	Total # of Faculty**	% of Faculty On Sabbatical	# of Course Exceptions
Bowie St. Un.	1	113	0.9%	8
Coppin St. Coll.	4	100	4.0%	11
Frostburg St. Un.	16	213	7.5%	56
Salisbury St. Un.	21	201	10.4%	92
Towson St. Un.	30	436	6.9%	139
Un. of Balto.***	3	120	2.5%	10
UMAB***	7	76	9.2%	21
UMBC	25	328	7.6%	67
UMCP	93	1,455	6.4%	234
UMES	1	71	1.4%	8
UMS	201	3,113	6.5%	646

* Either one semester or one year sabbatical.
** Tenured and tenure-track faculty and departmental administrators..
***Excluding the professional schools: law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy.

UMSA OAA: Nov 1994

Table 4
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
Faculty Non-Instructional Productivity

Academic Year 1992-1993*

Institution (# of Core Faculty, Depart. Admin., & Full-Time Inst. & Research Faculty)	$s in Externally-Funded Grants & Contracts**	# of Books Published	# of Refereed Works	# of Non-Ref. Works	# of Creative Activities	# of Professional Presentations	# of Days Spent in Public Serv.
Bowie St. Un. (152)	$1,499,676	10	30	114	120	54	2,025
Coppin St. Coll. (110)	$774,000	4	34	33	116	85	1,774
Frostburg St. Un. (242)	$653,380	17	70	173	189	147	11,272
Salisbury St. Un. (237)	$1,381,820	42	169	87	91	463	2,393
Towson St. Un. (472)	$1,678,013	89	363	460	567	654	5,362
Un. of Balto.*** (165)	$6,345,276	21	160	98	40	178	2,311
UMAB*** (1,228)	$110,712,451	151	2,559	941	113	2,934	10,068
UMBC (401)	$18,453,046	87	618	261	488	755	4,210
UMCP (1,688)	$110,302,059	429	4,536	2,503	1,733	4,972	25,456
UMES (145)	$2,792,597	6	67	90	135	100	2,093
Degree-Granting Inst.	$254,592,318	856	8,606	4,760	3,592	10,342	66,964
CEES (57)	$8,858,138	2	229	132	13	208	527
UMBI (35)	$5,660,000	6	119	34	1	132	314
All UMS	$269,110,456	864	8,954	4,926	3,606	10,682	67,805

* Except Salisbury, which includes 1993-1994 data. It should be noted that for all other institutions the timeframe (1992-1993) is different for the instructional and non-instructional productivity data, as the instructional productivity data are for Fall 1993 and Spring 1994.

** Does not include grants awarded to non-department units; e.g., Title III grants, except for UMAB, which includes all contracts and grants.

***Including the professional schools: law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy.

UMSA OAA Nov 1994

BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
Communications	8	8	8	2	20%	0	12	22	14	$40	100
Humnities & Fine Arts	8	16	27	5	16%	3	19	61	4	$0	988
Nat. Sc, Math & Comp Sc	8	12	25	3	11%	0	12	16	5	$1,269	72
Nursing	8	10	3	3	50%	4	4	0	3	$0	158
Bness, Pub Admin & Econ	8	18	14	4	22%	0	77	6	14	$0	467
Education & Physical Ed	8	14	30	5	14%	0	14	11	9	$191	127
Behavioral Sc & Human Se	8	12	16	2	11%	1	4	2	3	$0	105
History, Pol Sc & Inter.	8	8	19	2	10%	2	2	2	2	$0	8
BSU	[redacted]	98	142	26	15%	10	144	120	54	$1,500	2,025

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA OAA Nov 1994

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

COPPIN STATE COLLEGE

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
Fine & Comm. Arts	8	13	6	3	33%	0	0	54	3	$0	125
Lang., Lit., Journalism	8	4	13	2	13%	0	3	10	6	$0	213
					ERR						
Math & Comp. Science	8	14	6	4	40%	0	2	0	9	$75	171
Natural Science	8	21	5	6	55%	0	9	0	7	$410	104
Nursing	8	9	10	3	23%	0	4	8	21	$55	182
					ERR						
Management Science	8	2	6	1	14%	0	4	0	4	$0	0
					ERR						
Adult & Continuing Ed.	8	3	5	1	17%	4	13	2	35	$55	115
Curriculum & Instruction	8	8	2	3	60%	0	3	1	4	$4	236
Health & Physical Ed.	8	8	2	3	60%	0	1	5	3	$132	109
Spcecial Education	8	1	5	1	17%	0	3	1	3	$72	84
					ERR						
Applied Psych & Rehab Co	8	3	5	1	17%	0	5	3	9	$108	41
Criminal Justice	8	0	5	0	0%	2	9	4	25	$25	14
History, Geo., & Inter.	8	2	3	2	40%	0	7	0	8	$0	91
Social Sciences	8	7	4	3	43%	0	2	1	3	$13	53
					ERR						
CSC		95	77	33	30%	6	65	89	140	$948	1,538

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA OAA Nov 1994

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
Communications & Theatre	7	10	5	4	44%	0	2	13	3	$0	9
English	8	12	16	6	27%	2	37	19	15	$7	149
Music	7	6	3	2	40%	0	3	21	0	$0	41
Philosophy	8	6	2	2	50%	1	5	6	3	$0	7
Visual Arts	8	4	7	2	22%	0	4	32	3	$3	82
Biology	7	16.4	9	5	36%	0	17	0	7	$403	1,209
Chemistry	7	2	4	1	20%	0	2	0	0	$0	495
Computer Science	8	4	6	2	25%	1	1	0	0	$35	995
Mathematics	8	12	8	6	43%	1	5	8	32	$0	1,417
Physics	7	6	4	4	50%	1	65	53	12	$18	618
Accounting	8	16	6	4	40%	0	5	1	2	$0	97
Business Administration	8	23	11	7	39%	2	25	0	2	0	141
MBA Department	7	25	2	11	85%	1	7	0	1	$12	254
Educational Prof.	8	21	10	8	44%	0	14	9	17	$10	2,651
Health, Phys Ed & Rec	8	17.5	4	14	78%	0	8	0	3	$50	83
Economics	8	5	5	2	29%	0	11	0	0	$13	92
Geography	7	4.6	8	2	20%	5	5	2	10	$60	1,105
History	8	2	7	1	13%	1	16	2	11	$11	36
Political Science	8	6	5	2	29%	2	0	10	6	$0	723
Sociology	8	8	5	4	44%	0	1	1	3	$32	934
Psychology	8	8	10	2	17%	0	1	0	7	$0	96
Foreign Languages & Lit.	7	2	7	1	13%	0	9	12	8	$0	38

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

Department	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
FSU	[redacted]	216.5	144	92	39%	17	243	189	145	$653	11,272

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA OAA Nov 1994

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

SALISBURY STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

Department	93-94 Instructional Workload					93-94 Non-Instructional Productivity					
	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
Art	8	3	4	2	33%	0	2	3	6	$0	5
Communications	8	16	7	5	42%	0	4	17	20	$0	100
English	8	27	10	7	41%	13	32	1	38	$1	290
Music	8	18	3	4	57%	0	3	44	27	$7	72
Biology	8	21	9	7	44%	3	11	11	17	$102	27
Chemistry	8	8	7	3	30%	0	5	0	5	$19	25
Health Sciences	8	1.3	3	2	40%	1	3	0	0	$0	53
Math & Comp. Sc.	8	19.33	9	8	47%	1	10	1	18	$40	281
Nursing	8	24	9	7	44%	4	12	0	21	$60	255
Physics	8	7	4	2	33%	0	2	0	5	$13	11
Business	6	20	27	8	23%	9	75	2	90	$610	244
Education	8	24	15	5	25%	0	23	0	89	$143	254
Physical Ed.	8	3	5	3	38%	0	1	10	6	$0	83
Geography	8	2	6	1	14%	0	1	0	4	$0	22
History	8	15	14	5	26%	7	56	2	58	$378	327
Leisure Studies	8	2	0	1	100%	0	0	0	1	$0	38
Political Sc.	8	6	2	2	50%	3	1	0	6	$0	2
Psychology	8	13	8	4	33%	0	5	0	31	$7	222
Social Work	8	6	1	3	75%	0	3	0	5	$0	30
Sociology	8	9	3	2	40%	0	0	0	3	$2	5
For. Lang. & Phil.	8	20	4	6	60%	1	7	0	13	$0	49

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

SALISBURY STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					93-94 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
SSU	[redacted]	265	150	87	37%	42	256	91	463	$1,382	2,393

* The types of exception vary by department. See departmental reports.

LMSA OAA Nov 1994

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
Art	8	22	15	6	29%	0	13	56	4	$5	156
Dance	8	9	1	3	75%	0	10	15	3	$12	17
English	8	26	24	9	27%	10	63	10	56	$95	13
Music	8	31	22	6	21%	15	46	278	22	$26	237
Speech & Mass Comm.	8	23	16	8	33%	5	29	19	27	$0	68
Theatre Arts	8	18	2	7	78%	1	16	97	13	$1	196
Biological Sciences	8	9	19	3	14%	8	23	1	16	$133	147
Chemistry	8	18	7	4	36%	10	6	1	3	$24	58
Comm. Sc & Disorders	8	13	5	3	38%	1	2	3	21	$0	365
Computer & Information S	8	22	11	7	39%	3	26	3	13	$58	194
Health Science	8	27	6	6	50%	1	16	3	13	$94	522
Mathematics	8	32	10	16	62%	1	28	25	36	$58	129
Nursing	8	15	12	4	25%	0	12	0	22	0	439
Occupational Therapy	8	17	5	3	38%	1	16	0	16	$10	69
Physics	8	30	8	7	47%	0	2	0	29	$390	150
Accounting	8	4	12	1	8%	2	35	0	7	$0	28
Finance	8	12	4	3	43%	1	18	0	7	$0	203
Management	8	6	13	3	19%	1	38	0	21	$0	187
Marketing	8	4	8	1	11%	2	28	0	22	$0	36
Early Childhood Educatio	8	17	3	6	67%	0	52	1	20	$138	225
Elementary Education	8	7	11	4	27%	6	12	3	38	$0	359
General Education	8	21	5	7	58%	2	17	15	23	$85	245
Physical Education	8	25	12	6	33%	1	22	20	43	$0	498
Secondary Education	8	7	6	3	33%	1	13	5	34	$462	119

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
Economics	8	11	11	4	27%	2	32	0	7	$0	176
Geography & Env. Plannin	8	13	5	4	44%	2	17	0	10	$88	35
History	8	17	12	5	29%	4	39	0	12	$0	30
Philosophy	8	20	3	4	57%	0	14	7	34	$0	21
Political Science	8	20	5	6	55%	1	125	4	16	$0	14
Psychology	8	61	9	19	68%	3	28	1	53	$0	272
Sociology/Anthropology	8	28	8	7	47%	3	15	0	12	$0	128
Women Studies	8	0	2	0	0%	0	0	0	0	$0	0
Modern Languages	8	4	9	1	10%	2	10	0	1	$0	26
TSU		589	301	176	37%	89	823	567	654	$1,678	5,362

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA OAA Nov 1994

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
English & Communic. Des.	6	5	11	4	27%	8	78	26	36	$446	581
Science	6	0	1	0	0%	0	0	0	0	$0	0
Computer Sc & Math	6	8	3	2	40%	0	1	0	0	$0	2
Business	5	42	51	19	27%	9	127	9	89	$3,043	652
Sociology	6	4	3	2	40%	2	4	1	3	$0	107
Psychology	6	6	3	2	44%	0	1	0	4	$20	155
History & Philosophy	6	8	5	3	38%	0	9	3	13	$53	109
Government & Public Admi	6	8	7	4	36%	1	31	0	25	$2,709	529
Criminal Justice	6	10	2	3	60%	1	7	1	8	$74	176
UB	[redacted]	91	86	39	31%	21	258	40	178	$6,345	2,311

* The types of exception vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA OAA Nov 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Professional Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
American Studies	5	2	4	1	20%	1	1	0	10	$5	18
Ancient Studies	5	5	4	1	20%	0	1	0	2	$50	8
Dance	5	1	3	1	25%	0	2	54	15	$23	19
English	4	14	16	7	30%	5	16	14	26	$25	69
Music	5	2	9	1	10%	1	7	90	1	$0	111
Philosophy	5	8	5	4	44%	0	12	10	10	$63	54
Theatre	6	2	4	3	43%	2	6	118	15	$3	44
Visual & Performing Arts	5	0.4	14	1	7%	0	0	33	13	$278	76
Biology	3.5	13.5	20	8	29%	0	65	0	55	$3,278	263
Chemical Engineering	5	5	5	2	29%	0	12	0	21	$766	28
Chemistry	2	6.1	16	6	27%	16	78	24	88	$2,758	204
Computer Science	4	7	10	6	38%	7	60	2	34	$698	195
Electrical Engineering	5.5	16.1	3	6	67%	2	90	8	39	$2,142	50
Emergency Health Science	6	1	3	1	25%	1	10	0	8	$48	411
Information Sc. Mgment.	4	0	14	0	0%	4	18	3	14	$95	102
Mathematics	4	11	21	7	25%	3	88	3	38	$605	266
Mechanical Engineering	4	4.5	9	5	36%	0	38	5	17	$1,531	49
Nursing	6	12	12	6	33%	0	21	2	32	$102	469
Physics	3	3.1	12	4	25%	3	54	2	32	$854	78
Education	5	10	10	2	17%	10	26	6	67	$913	270
African-American Studie	4	0	9	0	0%	0	4	3	5	$0	0
Economics	5	21	11	7	39%	1	28	0	18	$223	127
Geography	4	0.7	8	1	11%	2	27	2	12	$431	54
History	4	3.5	15	2	12%	7	32	1	19	$132	22

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Professn. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
Policy Science	5	0	6	0	0%	1	24	16	13	$2,235	71
Political Science	5	1	13	1	7%	7	24	50	14	$8	188
Psychology	4	4.3	20	3	13%	2	73	14	63	$543	271
Sociology & Anthropology	4	4	16	1	6%	4	27	4	24	$334	322
Social Work	5	0	7	0	0%	0	5	20	20	$134	201
Modern Languages	5	16.1	6	9	60%	8	36	4	30	$177	170
UMBC	[redacted]	174	305	96	24%	87	885	488	755	$18,453	4,210

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA OAA Nov 1994

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
American Studies	6	7	5	3	38%	1	10	0	23	$30	83
Art	5	9.6	18	4	18%	4	23	117	41	$0	200
Art History & Archeology	4	10	10	5	33%	3	9	0	13	$0	62
Classics	5	4.5	4	3	43%	2	24	3	22	$163	92
Comparative Literature	4	1	5	1	17%	2	7	6	9	$0	60
Dance	5.3	6.1	6	3	33%	0	3	177	21	$2	112
English	5	82	31	40	56%	46	265	58	142	$73	790
Honors Program	No Core Fac	0	2	0	0%	0	1	0	1	$31	1
Journalism	5	25.7	13	11	46%	6	161	16	56	$77	309
Library & Info. Services	5	11.2	7	7	50%	0	25	2	56	$598	177
Music	5	17.1	34	9	21%	17	88	410	88	$35	282
Philosophy	4	17	12	9	43%	4	62	0	85	$109	19
Radio/TV/Film (Closed)	6	0	2	0	0%	0	0	10	9	$0	63
Speech Communications	5	8	6	4	40%	3	22	22	22	$5	43
Theatre	6	20	2	11	85%	0	9	355	12	$37	261
Architecture	4	6	23	3	12%	4	129	62	80	$0	322
Agricultural Engineeing	4	1.7	13	2	13%	0	130	16	62	$914	681
Agricultural Resource Ec	4	0	27	0	0%	1	115	2	66	$756	1,177
Agronomy	4	0.5	23	2	8%	6	155	16	72	$2,027	971
Animal Science	4	5	12	4	25%	4	185	0	85	$570	707
Institutute of Applied A	No Core Fac	4	4	3	43%	2	19	2	5	$64	140
Horticulture	3	0	27	0	0%	5	107	7	48	$695	568
Nutrition & Food Science	4	16.1	9	8	47%	0	26	0	34	$365	61
Poultry Science	4	0	11	0	0%	0	4	0	2	$487	8
Veterinary Medicine	3	2	10	2	17%	0	48	6	15	$265	522

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
Astronomy	2	6	18	4	18%	1	134	0	52	$4,400	117
Botany	5	34	10	17	63%	8	93	6	51	$1,855	591
Chemistry & Biochemistry	5	66	18	31	63%	6	187	17	108	$5,751	648
Computer Science	2	5	38	3	7%	13	305	4	181	$6,940	498
Entomology	5	5	11	6	35%	4	128	20	110	$2,246	713
Geology	4	5	15	3	17%	0	32	0	57	$674	235
Mathematics	4	116	54	45	45%	15	245	1	194	$1,476	693
Meteorology	3	1	9	1	10%	7	100	1	103	$5,079	210
Microbiology	2	12.3	14	2	13%	3	70	0	47	$744	130
Physics	2	20.7	63	17	21%	14	810	18	518	$15,887	845
Zoology	5	68	5	25	83%	5	175	56	107	$2,851	191
Aerospace Engineering	4	0.6	15	1	6%	0	83	5	67	$3,354	189
Chemical Engineering	4	3	9	2	18%	3	57	1	41	$1,849	76
Civil Engineering	5	6	28	2	7%	4	101	0	46	$2,730	141
Electrical Engineering	4	15	52	8	13%	24	377	20	226	$14,200	561
Fire Protection Engineer	4	6	4	2	33%	0	32	0	15	$490	62
Materials & Nuclear Eng.	4	7.8	23	6	21%	9	140	13	83	$3,460	164
Mechanical Engineering	4	55	16	25	61%	9	341	7	181	$4,321	752
Business & Management	4	9	69	5	7%	16	202	43	155	$630	604
Counseling & Personnel S	5	2.9	15	3	17%	7	144	22	76	$583	272
Curriculum & Instruction	5	28	27	13	33%	9	120	83	151	$676	950
Ed. Policy, Plan. & Admi	5	13	15	7	32%	5	53	4	51	$382	331
Health Education	4	7	13	3	19%	22	56	3	51	$1,586	422
Human Development	5	7	17	3	15%	7	90	27	109	$1,488	487

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
Industrial & Occ Ed (Cl	3	7	8	2	20%	1	18	9	23	$210	30
Kinesiology	4	12	19	5	21%	4	111	3	80	$959	1,017
Measurement & Statistics	5	4	7	1	13%	0	18	0	17	$193	76
Special Educatiojn	5	5	18	5	22%	5	109	4	95	$2,438	579
Afro-American Studies	4	0	9	0	0%	0	16	0	13	$61	122
Anthropology	4	1.9	12	2	14%	2	59	8	53	$113	644
Criminal Justice	4	2	12	1	8%	1	49	0	38	$1,683	338
Economics	4	11	36	6	14%	10	113	0	125	$2,157	1,422
Family Studies	4	3.4	11	3	21%	2	30	4	26	$105	101
Geography	4	2	13	1	7%	3	74	1	44	$3,000	180
Government & Politics	4	22	27	11	39%	16	116	4	80	$1,006	478
Hearing & Speech Science	4	8.2	6	7	54%	3	18	0	21	$238	101
History	4	21	42	10	19%	20	173	39	133	$1,082	864
Linguistics	4	1.3	7	1	13%	4	27	0	32	$70	16
Psychology	4	11	36	7	16%	4	138	7	119	$1,239	470
Public Affairs	4	5.2	12	4	25%	5	56	1	41	$2,839	489
Sociology	4	18	17	8	32%	15	78	0	54	$1,007	234
Women Studies	4	4	5	2	29%	3	17	0	29	$54	51
French & Italian	4.5	10	14	3	18%	5	19	7	21	$3	105
German & Slavic	4	8	14	6	30%	11	52	6	29	$381	302
Hebrew & East Asian Lang	4	7	14	4	22%	8	29	2	36	$426	197
Spanish & Portuguese	5	6	16	2	11%	6	17	0	14	$88	47
					ERR						
UMCP		923.8	1,229	459	27%	429	7,039	1,733	4,972	$110,302	25,456

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMBA OAA Nov 1994

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	93-94 Instructional Workload					92-93 Non-Instructional Productivity					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Exceptions*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load or More	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions	# of Books	# of Publicat.	# of Creative Activities	# of Profession. Presentat.	$s in Research (in $1,000)	# Days in Public Service
English	8	24.21	14	9	39%	0	19	36	8	$0	77
Fine Arts	8	4.48	4	4	50%	1	15	67	3	$0	237
Agriculture	8	46.06	4	12	75%	1	41	0	14	$691	292
Math & Computer Science	8	11.7	10	4	29%	1	10	2	13	$435	525
Natural Science	8	15.07	19	3	14%	0	16	1	11	$469	119
Physical Therapy	8	18.73	0	5	100%	0	1	0	0	$517	43
Technology	8	3.94	1	4	80%	0	8	4	4	$155	141
Airway Science	8	0	1	0	0%	0	0	0	0	$0	0
Business	8	7.42	9	3	25%	0	14	1	10	$5	283
Hotel & Restaurant Mgt.	8	8.34	4	2	33%	0	7	15	18	$0	50
Education	8	0.84	5	1	17%	1	4	3	5	$0	141
Physical Education	8	44.55	3	8	73%	0	0	0	0	$51	0
Human Ecology	8	28.24	0	8	100%	0	11	5	7	$424	56
Social Science	8	9	6	2	25%	2	11	1	7	$45	129
UMES		222.58	80	65	45%	6	157	135	100	$2,793	2,093

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMBSA OAA Nov 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

II - 1.25 - POLICY ON FACULTY WORKLOAD AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(Approved by the Board of Regents, August 19, 1994)

I. Purposes

The purposes of the "UMS Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities" are to promote optimal performance by the University of Maryland System and by each of its institutions in meeting the needs and expectations of its students and other clienteles, and to provide mechanisms that will ensure public accountability for that performance.
Because faculty are the primary performers of the System's instruction, research/scholarship and service, the policy must encourage and support faculty in applying their creativity, ingenuity, initiative, knowledge, experience, and professional skills in performing many diverse functions. Faculty are expected to meet their responsibilities independently and in full accord with both institutional expectations and established tenets of academic freedom.

This policy reflects the centrality of instruction at degree-granting institutions while acknowledging the essential development of knowledge through research/scholarship and its application to societal needs.

II. Application

The policy applies to the following individuals:

1. All persons holding tenured and tenure-track positions who are classified as faculty (instructional, research and public service) and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System;

2. All persons who, while holding faculty rank, are classified as administrators and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and perform their administrative duties at the level of academic department or equivalent academic unit, including chairs, assistant chairs, program director, etc.;

3. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the UMS, are classified as instructional faculty and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System; and

4. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the UMS, are classified as research faculty and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and whose salaries are supported, in whole or in part, by state funds.

The University of Baltimore Law School and the University of Maryland at Baltimore schools of law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy shall develop separate policies for their faculties. These policies, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, shall provide accountability fully comparable to that provided in this policy.

This policy does not apply to individuals who hold faculty rank but who are assigned to administrative duties outside the department or equivalent academic units, for example, deans, vice presidents, presidents, etc.; nor does it apply to individuals who are classified as research faculty but whose salary is fully supported by non-state funds, e.g., federal research grants.

III. Responsibilities

Each institutional president shall establish, in consultation with faculty and academic administrators, and subject to approval by the Chancellor, institution-specific policy and implementation mechanisms consistent with the University of Maryland System's "Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities." Institution-specific policies, including proviso for departmental/school variation, shall include explicit statements of expectations and accountability mechanisms, including the means for comparing faculty performance with workload expectations and reporting the results of such comparisons.

IV. Standard Workload Expectations

Each institution's policy shall include standard expectations for faculty workload. It is understood that there will be exceptions and that those exceptions will be both accounted for and justified. Generally, standard expectations will cover instruction, research/scholarship, and service, and will be consistent with the mission of the institution. The proper balance among instruction, scholarship/research, and service for an individual faculty member may change over the faculty member's career. For each individual faculty member, a substantial difference between the actual and the standard expectation for any basic workload element will be balanced

compensating changes in one or both of the other basic workload elements. Workload expectations for each faculty member should be reviewed annually by the responsible department chair and/or other appropriate administrator and adjusted as necessary and appropriate. The following table provides guidelines for the general standard expectation in the categories of instruction, research/scholarship and service. It is understood that there may be differences across departments of an institution, as approved by the president.

INSTITUTION TYPE	INSTRUCTION*	RESEARCH/ SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
COMPREHENSIVE			
% OF TOTAL EFFORT	65-75	15-25	5-15
# COURSE UNITS/YR	7-8		
RESEARCH			
% OF TOTAL EFFORT	45-55	35-45	5-15
# COURSE UNITS/YR	5-6		
NON-DEGREE GRANTING			
% OF TOTAL EFFORT	5-15	75-85	15-25

*Including directed research and individual studies.

Instructional effort includes, in addition to classroom time, all concomitant activities necessary to the preparation, delivery and evaluation of instruction and learning, including the various forms of student advising. The sum of the "% of total effort" in each area must equal 100% for each individual faculty member.

For purposes of defining standard instructional load expectations, the course unit is defined as equivalent to a three-credit course. Individuals whose instructional load includes other than three-credit courses will have their standard instructional load expectations defined accordingly.

The following weights should be used to convert graded instructional experiences that do not follow the traditional course format (e.g., individual studies, supervision of dissertation research, etc.) to course units.

Course Level	N of Credits = 1 Course Unit
800-899 (dissertation & doctoral level individual studies)	10 credits = 1 course unit
799 (masters thesis)	13 credits = 1 course unit
500-798 (other graduate level individual studies)	18 credits = 1 course unit
400-499 (graduate/undergraduate level individual studies)	21 credits = 1 course unit
100-399 (undergraduate level individual studies)	30 credits = 1 course unit

Workload expectations for each faculty member in the areas of research/scholarship and service shall be specified according to institutional mission.

In order to focus on the centrality of instruction, all faculty members, including those with administrative responsibilities at the departmental level, shall be involved in the instructional program. Further, senior faculty in departments having undergraduate programs shall participate in undergraduate teaching.

V. **Exceptions to Standard Workload Expectations.**

All faculty at degree-granting institutions are expected to be involved in instruction, research/scholarship and service as previously defined. Recognizing that some faculty will assume new or additional responsibilities in any one of these areas, exceptions to the standard workload may be made. However, the department is responsible for making the necessary adjustments in the total faculty workload so that departmental expectations in each of these areas are fulfilled. These expectations will be determined by student and curricular needs, shall be consistent with the resources available to the department, and shall be approved by the president. Institutions shall make the minimum number of exceptions necessary for fulfillment of its institutional mission. Exceptions to the standard workload may be made based on the following considerations.

1. Instruction. Exceptions from the standard instructional load may be based upon a number of factors, including class size; development of new courses; modality of instruction, including distance education; level of instruction; discipline; accreditation requirements; etc.

2. Departmental Administration. Assumption of responsibility for the functions of chair, assistant chair, or program director, or for special departmental projects, may require reduction of expectations for service, research/scholarship or instruction. The magnitude of such reduction shall be dependent on the scope of administrative responsibilities and size of the department.

3. Externally Funded Research and Service Activities. Assignment of additional time for research or service activities can be supported by external funds, either research or training grants. In these instances, the accompanying reduction of expectations for service or instruction should mirror the replacement of departmental salary support by externally-funded salary support.

4. Department-Supported Research. (Departmental Research). Assignment of additional time for research activities supported by the department and consequent reduction of expectations for service or instruction should be related to the institution's mission.

5. Department-Supported Service. Assignment of additional time in areas of service and consequent reduction of expectations for research/scholarship or instruction should be directly related to the duration and the extent of the commitment. For example, individual faculty members may be released from the standard expectation in the areas of research/scholarship or instruction in order to make major professional contributions -- e.g., to work in partnership with the public schools or with business or industry.

VI. Accountability

The institutional reward structure will take cognizance of the workload assignment for each faculty member. Institutions shall develop procedures for the systematic review of faculty, recognize outstanding performance, and establish consequences for failure to fulfill expectations.

The focus of external accountability (to the Regents and to the State) will be the department or academic unit, not the individual faculty member. The primary means for ensuring proper accountability will be after-the-fact reporting of actual departmental performance in comparison with the expectations previously approved by the president. Each president shall submit annually to the Chancellor an accountability report in a form to be developed by the Chancellor.

Attachment B

DEVELOPMENT OF THE UMS POLICY ON FACULTY WORKLOAD AND RESPONSIBILITIES

March 17	-	"Framework" for Board of Regents Policy (dated March 17) submitted to Advisory Team. Product: draft of "Regents' Policy on Faculty Productivity," dated March 27.
March 24	-	Legislative hearings on faculty workload.
March 31	-	Discussion with Academic Vice Presidents (AAAC), the executive committee of the Council of University System Faculty (CUSF), and the Advisory Committee. Draft policy dated March 27 reviewed. Product: "Proposed UMS Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities," dated April 4.
April 4	-	Chancellor's Council (UMS Presidents) discussed draft policy dated April 4.
April 7	-	Board of Regents' Education Policy Committee briefed on draft policy dated April 7.
April 8	-	Draft policy dated April 8 formally transmitted by the Chancellor to the Presidents. Copies shared with legislative and MHEC staff. Meeting held with UMSA and MHEC staff to discuss draft.
April 25	-	April 25 draft of policy (which incorporated legislative and MHEC staff's comments) presented to AAAC. Product: Draft dated April 27. This draft was discussed with MHEC staff and formally transmitted to Secretary Aery for her comments.
May 2	-	April 27 draft of policy presented to the Chancellor's Council. Product: "Departmental variations" added to draft policy dated May 9.
May 9	-	May 9 draft reviewed by AAAC.
May 11	-	May 9 draft reviewed by CUSF.
May 12	-	May 9 draft forwarded to Secretary Aery.
May 13	-	Letter from Secretary Aery with her comments on draft dated April 27 received by Chancellor Langenberg.

May 16	-	Draft dated May 16 (which incorporates most of the suggestions from CUSF) presented to the Advisory Committee.
May 26	-	Proposed policy referred, for action, to the Board of Regents' Education Policy Committee.
May 27	-	Opinion is requested from the Attorney General's Office of the proposed policy.
June 14	-	Legislative hearings on faculty workload continue. Proposed policy presented to the budget committees.
August 19	-	Board of Regents adopts "Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities."

P:\FACLOAD.TI3

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
FALL 1993 - SPRING 1994 REPORT ON FACULTY TEACHING LOAD

INSTITUTION/DEPARTMENT:

Line #	Basis for Standard Teaching Load of Core Fac.:	Type of Faculty: Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty	Departmental Administrators w/ Fac. Rank	Full-Time Non-Ten/Non-Track Inst. Faculty	Full-Time Non-Ten/Non-Track Res. Fac.	Other Faculty	Teaching Assistants	Department Total
1	N of Headcount Faculty							
2	93-94 Standard Annual Course Units Load							
3	N of Courses Taught (on Load)							
4	N of Other Course Units Taught							
5	N of Student Credit Hours Generated							
6	N of Courses Taught on Overload							
7	N of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load or More							
8	N of Fac Exempted from Teaching Standard Load							
	By Type of Exception (N of Faculty | Total Course Reduction)							
9	Instruction-Related							
10	Departmental Administration							
11	Externally Funded Research and Service							
12	Department-Supported Research							
13	Department Supported Service - Profession							
14	Department-Supported Service - Internal							
15	Department-Supported Service - Public							
16	Sabbatical							
17	Illness/Death/Other, Specify							
	Research, Scholarship and Other Selected Activities (Fall 1992- Spring 1993)							
18	# of Books Published							
19	# of Refereed Works							
20	# of Non-refereed Works							
21	# of Creative Activities							
22	# of Professional Presentations							
23	# of Externally Funded Grants & Contracts							
24	# of Faculty Awarded Grants							
25	$s Awarded in Grants & Contracts							
26	# of Days Spent in Public Service							
27	# of Days Spent in Advising Student Organizations							

*Not applicable

ATTACHMENT C

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
FALL 1993 - SPRING 1994 REPORT ON FACULTY TEACHING LOAD

- INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS -

1. **Time frame**. The time period covered by this report is Fall 1993 and Spring 1994.

2. **Type of Faculty**. All information is requested by type of faculty. The last column provides for departmental totals.

   Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty. All persons holding tenured and tenure-track positions who are classified as faculty (regardless of sub-classification: instructional, research and public service), and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System.

   Departmental Administrators. All persons who, while holding faculty rank, are classified as administrators and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and perform their administrative duties at the level of academic department or equivalent academic unit, including chairs, assistant chairs, program director, etc.;

   Full-Time, Non-Tenured, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the UMS, are classified as instructional faculty and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System.

   Full-Time Non-Tenured, Non-Tenure Track Research or Public Service Faculty. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the UMS, are classified as research or public service faculty and so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and whose salaries are supported, in whole or in part, by state funds.

   Other Faculty. All other persons, other than teaching assistants, who taught in this department, either in one or in both semesters. This category includes adjunct and affiliated faculty, all part-time faculty, and non-departmental administrators (deans, assistant deans, etc.) who taught in this department. The only information required for this type of faculty is their number, the number of courses and course units taught, and the student credit hours generated.

   Teaching Assistants. Typically, graduate students in the department whose tuition and fees are waived, and who may receive other remuneration in return for some type of instruction-related responsibilities within the department. The

only information required for teaching assistants is their number, the number of courses taught, and the student credit hours generated.

3. **Basis for Departmental Expected Teaching Load.** Very briefly, describe the basis for the department expected teaching load for core faculty. For example, institutional policy; national practice; accreditation requirements; etc.

4. **Line 1: Number of Headcount Faculty**. Include faculty who were on sabbatical, or employed for only one semester. Faculty who held a joint appointment in another department or UMS institution should be reported as a fraction based on their appointment to the reporting department.

5. **Line 2: 93-94 Standard Annual Course Units Load**. The number of course units that each faculty member was expected to teach during the academic year 1993-1994. Standard loads may differ by type of faculty. For purposes of defining standard instructional workload expectations, the course unit is defined as equivalent to a three-credit course. Departments which formulate this expectation in terms of credit hours, should convert the expected teaching load, for reporting purposes, to courses; e.g., 24 credit hours being equivalent to 8 courses.

   The following weights should be used to convert graded instructional experiences that do not follow the traditional course format (e.g., individual studies, supervision of dissertation research, supervision of student teaching, etc.) to course units.

Course Level	N of Credits = 1 Course Unit
800-899 (dissertation & doctoral level individual studies)	10 Credits = 1 Course Unit
799 (masters thesis)	13 Credits = 1 Course Unit
500-798 (other graduate level individual studies)	18 Credits = 1 Course Unit
400-499 (graduate/undergraduate level individual studies)	21 Credits = 1 Course Unit
100-399 (undergraduate level individual studies)	30 Credits = 1 Course Unit

6. **Line 3: Number of Courses Taught on Load.** The total number of courses taught on load by each type of faculty. A course should be attributed to only one faculty. The attribution of team taught courses and courses taught with the assistance of teaching assistants is to be decided by the department chair, dean, or provost. If a faculty member appointed solely to this department taught a course in another department, such course(s) should be included here.

7. **Line 4: Number of Other Course Units Taught.** See table in 5 above for the weights that should be used to convert graded instructional experiences that do not follow the traditional course format (e.g., individual studies, supervision of dissertation research, etc.) to course units. If a faculty member appointed solely to this department taught a course unit in another department, such course unit(s) should be included here.

8. **Line 5: Number of Student Credit Hours.** The total number of student credit hours generated by each type of faculty.

9. **Line 6: Number of Courses Taught on Overload.** The total number of courses taught on overload (for remuneration above base salary) by each type of faculty. This item is not applicable to part-time faculty nor to teaching assistants.

10. **Line 7: Number of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load or More**. Number of faculty members who taught the number of course units specified in line 1.

    Note: Part-time core faculty, full-time faculty employed for only one semester, faculty on leave without pay, and faculty who held a joint appointment in another department or UMS institution, and whose teaching load was proportional to the standard load should be included here. For example, a part-time core faculty employed half-time who taught half the standard load should be included here. Similarly, individuals whose appointments are supported in whole or in part by Agricultural Experiment Station or Cooperative Extension Service's funds, and whose teaching load was proportional to the standard load should also be included here. For example, a faculty member half of whose salary was paid with Cooperative Extension Service funds, and who taught half the standard load should be included here.

11. **Line 8: Number of Faculty Exempted from Teaching Standard Load**. The number of faculty members who did not teach the course units specified in line 2. (Note: line 7 + line 8 = line 1.)

12. **Lines 9 through 17: By Type of Exception (N of Faculty | Total Course Reduction).** The faculty members reported in line 8 should be distributed according to the principal reason for their not teaching the course units specified in line 2. When more than one type of exception applies, the one accounting for most of the faculty member's reassigned time should be used. (Note: addition of number of faculty in lines 9 through 17 = line 8). The total course reduction for each exception category should also be reported. For example, if one tenured professor was released of teaching two courses to develop a new course, and a tenure-track assistant professor was released of teaching one course to teach a course on an off-campus center, the entries in

"Instruction-Related" (line 9), under "Core Faculty," would be 2 | 3 (e.g., two faculty members were released from teaching three courses).

Line 9: Instruction. Exceptions from the standard teaching load based upon instruction-related factors, including class size; development of new courses; modality of instruction, including distance education; level of instruction; etc.

Line 10: Departmental Administration. Assumption of responsibility for the functions of chair, assistant chair, or program director, or for special departmental projects[1].

Line 11: Externally Funded Research and Service Activities. Assignment of additional time for research or service activities supported by external funds, either research or training grants.

Line 12: Department-Supported Research. (Departmental Research). Assignment of additional time for research activities supported by the department.

Line 13: Department-Supported Service - Profession. Assignment of additional time to serve in areas of service to the profession; e.g., as editor of a large journal.

Line 14: Department-Supported Service - Internal. Assignment of additional time in areas of service to the institution/system to serve in committees, as chair of faculty senate, etc.

Line 15: Department-Supported Service - Public. Assignment of additional time in areas of service to the public: schools, business, government, and non-profit organizations.

Line 16: Sabbatical. Exempted from teaching (either for a semester or for the entire academic year) by reason of being on sabbatical.

Line 17: Illness/Death/Other. If "other", specify for each faculty exemption falling in this category.

13. **Lines 18 through 27: Non-Instructional Productivity**. Summary of the non-instructional productivity of the departmental faculty. These data are collected through the Survey of Faculty Non-Instructional Productivity.

---

[1]This category is applicable to those institutions who do not classify their department chairs as "administrators", but as faculty with released time for administration. It is not applicable to faculty who are classified as administrators (second column).

Line 18: Number of books published, including textbooks and edited works.

Line 19: Number of refereed works (such as journal articles, poems, short stories, etc.) published, including chapters in books.

Line 20: Number of non-refereed works published by commercial and non-commercial organizations, including newspaper articles.

Line 21: Number of creative activities ("non-verbal research") completed or in which the faculty member had a meaningful participation, including artistic (musical, theatrical and dance) performances; art exhibits; recitals; concerts; etc.

Line 22: Number of presentations given to conferences, seminars, etc. sponsored by professional associations.

Line 23: Number of externally funded research and training grants received this year.

Line 24: Number of faculty members in the department who were awarded externally funded research and training grants.

Line 25: Total dollar amount expended this fiscal year from all externally funded research and training grants awarded to faculty members.

Line 26: Number of days spent in public service with public school systems, government agencies, non-profit organizations, and businesses.

Line 27: Number of days spent advising/supporting campus-based student organizations.